

REMARKS

At the time of the Office Action dated July 25, 2008, claims 1-13, 15, 16, and 18-20 were pending in this application. In this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended, and claims 13, 15, 16, and 18-20 have been cancelled, without prejudice, reserving right to prosecution in a continuation application. Care has been exercised not to introduce new matter. Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found in, for example, the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 of the specification.

Claims 1-12 are now active in this application, of which claim 1 is independent.

Claim rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner stated that claim 1 “presents a logical inconsistency such that reception of both the first and second signals requires that the distributor distribute both the first and second signals without the first signal being passed through said distributor” (paragraph 2 of the Office Action).

In response, Applicants have revised the limitations regarding the distributor in claim 1 as follows: “a distributor which distributes said received ~~first and second~~ signal signals to said primary channel selector/demodulator and said secondary channel selector/demodulator.” Accordingly, there is no logical inconsistency between the revised limitations and the following limitations: “when said first signal is received by said input unit, said received first signal is input to said primary channel selector/demodulator without being passed through said distributor” (emphasis added).

Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of the claims and favorable consideration thereof.

Claim rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 13, 15, 16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,505, hereinafter “Konishi”) in view of Richter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,333,791, hereinafter “Richter”), and further in view of Stone (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184650); and claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konishi and Richter in view of Stone, and further in view of Zeidler et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0001970). These rejections have been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 13, 15, 16, and 18-20. Withdrawal of the art rejections of the claims is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner’s amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants’ attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

Application No.: 10/619,493

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Tomoki Tanida

Registration No. 60,453

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 KEG:TT:amz
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: October 25, 2008

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**